

Amendment and Response

Applicant: Jeffrey Davis et al.

Serial No.: 09/812,754

Filed: March 20, 2001

Docket No.: 10010106-1

Title: SCROLLING METHOD USING SCREEN POINTING DEVICE

REMARKS

This Amendment is responsive to the Office Action mailed August 19, 2003. In that Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 6-20, 23, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Tiphane, U.S. Patent No. 5,805,161 ("Tiphane"). The Examiner also rejected claims 3-4 and 21-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tiphane and further in view of Ishikawa, U.S. Patent No. 5,506,951 ("Ishikawa").

With this Response, claim 19 has been amended. Claims 1-4, and 6-24 remain pending in the application and are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 6-20, 23, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Tiphane, U.S. Patent No. 5,805,161 ("Tiphane"). Independent claim 1 includes the limitations:

providing a first plurality of user selectable scrolling zones on the display screen, each scrolling zone in the first plurality of scrolling zones associated with a scrolling technique and corresponding to scrolling in a first direction, each of the scrolling zones in the first plurality being positioned substantially adjacent to a first edge of the display screen;

providing a second plurality of user selectable scrolling zones on the display screen, each scrolling zone in the second plurality of scrolling zones associated with a scrolling technique and corresponding to scrolling in a second direction that is different from the first direction, each of the scrolling zones in the second plurality being positioned substantially adjacent to a second edge of the display screen, wherein the first edge is opposite to the second edge;

The Examiner did not appear to address the limitation in claim 1 that "the first edge is opposite to the second edge". Tiphane does not teach or suggest a first and a second plurality of scrolling zones, each plurality corresponding to scrolling in different directions, and each plurality positioned on opposite edges of a screen as claimed in claim 1. Rather, Tiphane discloses a horizontal scroll box 450 and a vertical scroll box 440. (See, e.g., Tiphane at Figures 4A, 4B, and 5, and corresponding description). These scroll bars are not positioned on opposite edges of a display screen, and these scroll bars do not each include a plurality of scrolling zones as defined in claim 1.

Amendment and Response

Applicant: Jeffrey Davis et al.

Serial No.: 09/812,754

Filed: March 20, 2001

Docket No.: 10010106-1

Title: SCROLLING METHOD USING SCREEN POINTING DEVICE

Tiphane also discloses a pop-up box menu 420. (Tiphane at Figures 4A, 4B, and 5). Tiphane discloses that “[t]he pop-up box menu has nine buttons representing particular functions including a button for vertical scrolling 425 and a button for horizontal scrolling 430.” (Tiphane at col. 5, lines 6-9). Tiphane does not appear to define what the functions are of the other seven buttons in the pop-up box menu. There is no teaching or suggestion in Tiphane that the other seven buttons in the pop-up box menu are related to scrolling functions. Tiphane’s disclosure regarding the pop-up box menu with a single button for vertical scrolling 425 and a single button for horizontal scrolling 430 does not teach or suggest a first and a second plurality of scrolling zones, each plurality corresponding to scrolling in different directions, and each plurality positioned on opposite edges of a screen as claimed in claim 1.

In view of the above, independent claim 1 is not taught or suggested by Tiphane. In addition, dependent claims 2, 6-18, and 24, which further limit patentably distinct claim 1, are also believed to be allowable over the cited reference. The Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner’s rejection of claims 1, 2, 6-18, and 24, and allowance of claims 1, 2, 6-18, and 24 is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 19, as amended, includes the limitation “each user selectable scrolling zone in the first plurality of scrolling zones associated with a scrolling technique and having a user selectable area defined by hidden boundaries”. The Examiner stated that “[a]s per independent claim 19 and dependent claim 20, they are rejected based upon similar rational as above independent claim 1 and dependent claim 2.” (Office Action at page 6, para. no. 6). The Examiner’s statements regarding claim 1 and dependent claim 2 did not address hidden boundaries. However, the Examiner did state that “[w]ith respect to dependent claim 24, wherein at least one of the scrolling zones is defined by hidden boundaries that are invisible to a user of the electronic device. (Tiphane discloses removing the pop-up box menu from the display screen of the display, col. 5, lines 59-60, therefore making the scroll boxes invisible to a user).” (Office Action at page 7, para. no. 6). Tiphane does not teach or suggest user selectable scrolling zones having a user selectable area defined by hidden boundaries as claimed in claim 19. The boundaries of buttons 425 and 430 in pop-up box menu 420 are clearly visible in Figures 4A, 4B, and 5, of Tiphane. If the pop-up box

Amendment and Response

Applicant: Jeffrey Davis et al.

Serial No.: 09/812,754

Filed: March 20, 2001

Docket No.: 10010106-1

Title: SCROLLING METHOD USING SCREEN POINTING DEVICE

menu is removed from the display screen as suggested by the Examiner, the buttons 425 and 430 would be removed and would not be “user selectable” as claimed in claim 19.

In view of the above, independent claim 19 as amended is not taught or suggested by Tiphane. In addition, dependent claim 20, which further limits patentably distinct claim 19, is also believed to be allowable over the cited reference. Allowance of claims 19 and 20 is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 23 includes the limitations “determining . . . a first movement velocity . . .;” and “scrolling the displayed information on the display screen . . . in an amount based on the first movement velocity, the scrolling amount greater than the amount of movement of the screen pointer.” The Examiner did not appear to address these limitations of claim 23. Tiphane does not teach or suggest determining a velocity from movement information provided by a screen pointing device, nor scrolling an amount based on such velocity, nor that the scrolling amount is greater than the amount of movement of the screen pointer.

In view of the above, independent claim 23 is not taught or suggested by Tiphane, and the Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner’s rejection of claim 23. Allowance of claim 23 is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 3-4 and 21-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tiphane and further in view of Ishikawa, U.S. Patent No. 5,506,951 (“Ishikawa”).

Claims 3 and 4 are dependent on independent claim 1. As described above with respect to claim 1, Tiphane does not teach or suggest a first and a second plurality of scrolling zones, each plurality corresponding to scrolling in different directions, and each plurality positioned on opposite edges of a screen as claimed in claim 1. Ishikawa also does not teach or suggest these limitations of claim 1.

In view of the above, dependent claims 3 and 4, which further limit patentably distinct claim 1, are also believed to be allowable over the cited references, either alone, or in combination. The Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner’s rejection of claims 3 and 4, and allowance of claims 3 and 4 is respectfully requested.

Amendment and Response

Applicant: Jeffrey Davis et al.

Serial No.: 09/812,754

Filed: March 20, 2001

Docket No.: 10010106-1

Title: SCROLLING METHOD USING SCREEN POINTING DEVICE

Claims 21 and 22 are dependent on independent claim 19. As described above with respect to claim 19, Tiphane does not teach or suggest user selectable scrolling zones having a user selectable area defined by hidden boundaries as claimed in claim 19. Ishikawa also does not teach or suggest these limitations of claim 19.

In view of the above, dependent claims 21 and 22, which further limit patentably distinct claim 19, are also believed to be allowable over the cited references, either alone, or in combination. Allowance of claims 21 and 22 is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

In light of the above, Applicant believes independent claims 1, 19, and 23, and the claims depending therefrom, are in condition for allowance. Allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to Jeff A. Holmen at the below-listed telephone number or Pamela Lau Kee at Telephone No. (408)

Amendment and Response

Applicant: Jeffrey Davis et al.

Serial No.: 09/812,754

Filed: March 20, 2001

Docket No.: 10010106-1

Title: SCROLLING METHOD USING SCREEN POINTING DEVICE

553-3059, Facsimile No. (408) 553-3063. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

Agilent Technologies, Inc.
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Department, M/S DL429
P.O. Box 7599
Loveland, CO 80537-0599

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffrey Davis et al.,

By their attorneys,

DICKE, BILLIG & CZAJA, PLLC
Fifth Street Towers, Suite 2250
100 South Fifth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 573-0178
Facsimile: (612) 573-2005

Date: 10/20/03
JAH:jmc

Jeff A. Holmen
Jeff A. Holmen
Reg. No. 38,492

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.8:

The undersigned hereby certifies that this paper or papers, as described herein, are being deposited in the United States Postal Service, as first class mail, in an envelope address to: Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 20th day of October, 2003.

By Jeff A. Holmen
Name: Jeff A. Holmen